

RALEIGH, June 15, 1850.

DEAR SIR—At a Convention of the Democratic party of North Carolina, held at this place on the 13th and 14th instants, the undersigned was appointed a Committee to announce to you that you were unanimously and enthusiastically chosen as the Democratic candidate for the office of Governor of this State at the ensuing election.

We were desirous to assure you that your acceptance of this nomination is most anxiously desired by the whole party, and that the sacrifices you have heretofore made in the service of your country, and the devotion you have shown to her true interests, inspire the confidence that you will make this additional sacrifice. It is confidently believed that under your lead the Democratic party will be successful in the ensuing contest; and it is the deliberate decision of the Convention that under no other leader could our hopes of victory be as strong, or the whole party rally to their standard with such unanimity.

Under this view of the subject, the Convention did not permit itself to doubt that your patriotic patriotism would bring you to the rescue, at whatever cost.

Permit us to add our earnest individual solicitations to those of the Convention, and to assure you of the very high respect and esteem in which you are held by your friends and obedient servants,

RO. STRANGE.

G. W. CALDWELL.

JAMES S. BATTLE.

JOHN S. EATON.

JOHN EXUM.

Hon. DAVID S. REID.

REIDSVILLE, N. C., June 22, 1850.

GENTLEMEN—In consequence of my absence from home, I did not receive your letter of the 15th inst., informing me of my nomination by the Convention as the Democratic candidate for Governor at the ensuing election, till yesterday evening.

A nomination so honorably made, and in which I do not hesitate to accept. The bestowal of this additional mark of confidence calls forth the most grateful feelings of my heart.

I shall at once go into the canvass and devote myself to it until the election. I regret that the want of time will prevent me from canvassing many parts of the State with the rapidity which I desire.

The history of the past affords me no cause to distrust my friends; they know their duty and they will perform it. If their efforts shall be crowned with success in electing me to fill the distinguished office for which I have been nominated, my earnest exertions shall be directed to the advancement of the prosperity and happiness of the people of the State, and to give to North Carolina rank, influence, and consideration among the States of the Union to which she is justly entitled.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

DAVID S. REID.

To Messrs. Ro. Strange, G. W. Caldwell, James S. Battle, John S. Eaton, John Exum, Committee.

To the People of North Carolina.

My name having been presented to you as a candidate for Governor, at the ensuing election is my apology for this address. As I do not claim the support of any man, against his honest convictions of duty to his country, I shall address myself to the reason and understanding of the people, and cheerfully abide their decision.

Believing that the great measures of public policy advanced by the Democratic party, calculated to promote the prosperity and welfare of the country, I have given to those measures my cordial support. If asked what these measures are, I may point to our statutes and the history of the country for an answer. I may point to the overthrow of a corrupt National Bank, and the establishment of the Constitutional Treasury; to the reformation of the land office, and the enactment of the more liberal policy embraced in the act of 1846; and to the acquisition of large, valuable, and fertile Territories, destined to add wealth and strength to this great country. These, and other measures, I may point to, as proud monuments of the patriotism, the purity, and wisdom of Democratic policy. Although a Democrat, I owe no allegiance to party factions; the policy of the country is calculated to promote the good of the country.

The adjustment of the slavery question is a subject of deep interest to every portion of the Union, and more especially to the South, with whose fate our interests and destiny are inseparably intertwined. Before my entrance into public life, the agitation of this subject led to what is familiarly known as the "Missouri Compromise." Although I believed that, in entering into that compromise, the South had, for the sake of peace and harmony, conceded too much to the North, yet when I came into public life I was disposed to carry out that compromise in good faith. We had a right to demand the same of the North, that she would, on her part, stand by the compromise. But in this we have been sadly disappointed. A very large portion of the people of the North now seek to violate it, by demands incompatible with the interests, the safety, and the honor of the Southern States. The Territory of the United States, the common blood and common treasure of all the States; and to appropriate it to the use of some of the States, to the exclusion of others, would be a violation of every principle of justice and equality. Moreover, a vast amount of slave property is every year escaping into the Northern States, and most of those States, instead of faithfully carrying out the compromise, are endeavoring to prevent its execution, and to prevent the recapture of fugitive slaves. In this way the South has lost millions. This grievance demands redress. The slavery question is of vital importance to us. To the North it is a mere abstract political question. To us, it is not only a question of right, involving an incalculable amount of private property, but it is a question of the safety, and above all, the domestic quiet and security of ourselves and families. The crisis demands that the South should take a firm stand in defence of her rights. I have always been a Union man. I yield to no man in devotion to this glorious Union, and I desire to see it preserved and perpetuated to all time. After the enjoyment of party rights, the preservation of the Union is more desirable to me than the preservation of the Union. But the best and surest means, in my humble opinion, to preserve and perpetuate the Union, is for the South to take a firm and decided stand in favor of her rights, against the encroachments of the North.

I did not approve of the movement in favor of calling the National Convention, and I personally, in accordance with a large number of gentlemen, both Democrats and Whigs, who were in favor of that Convention, enables me to repel the charge that they were in favor of treason or disunion. They are gentlemen of elevated patriotism, and are ardently attached to the Union.

I hope that these salutary counsels may prevail, and that this distracting question may at once be settled upon principles of justice to the South.

While a member of Congress I endeavored to adhere to the principles of the Missouri Compromise; and when a bill was before that body to establish a Territorial Government for Oregon, containing a clause inhibiting slavery, in that Territory—saying that no slave should be taken into that Territory, or restriction or against extending the protection of our laws to that distant people—I voted for the bill, together with many Southern gentlemen. Some partisan Whig newspapers have seized on this pre-text, and charged me with having voted for the Wilmot Proviso. This charge is untrue; for I am, and ever have been, opposed to the Proviso, and have never voted for it at any time or in any way.

The restriction in the Oregon bill applied to that Territory alone, all of which lies north of the Missouri Compromise line, whereas the Wilmot Proviso proposes to inhibit slavery both North and South of that line. I voted for the Resolutions—saying Texas, which is wholly south of the Missouri Compromise line, and all of Texas, North of the same line. These Resolutions were voted for by all the Democrats from the South, yet in doing so we did not vote for the Wilmot Proviso. While on this subject, it occurs to me that if these Whig partisans would spend more of their time in examining the opinions of their own candidates, and less in misrepresenting the opinions of Democratic candidates, it would be better for the country. Two years ago I cautioned them against voting for Gen. Taylor, without a public declaration of his opinions. They would not take my advice, but turned round and denounced Gen. Cass as a "Wilmot Proviso Abolitionist," and that too in the face of the fact that he had publicly declared his opinion to the contrary. Gen. Taylor was honored with the vote of North Carolina, and Gen. Cass was defeated. Since then, who has done more for the South than Gen. Taylor? Gen. Cass, although instructed by the Legislature of this State to vote for the Wilmot Proviso, boldly and elo-

quently appealed to the North to do us justice, and openly proclaimed that before he would vote to carry out the instructions to perpetrate this injustice upon the South, he would resign his seat in the Senate. His appeal to the people of this State was not in vain: the same Legislature assembled, and in a spirit of liberality highly creditable to themselves and still more complimentary to him, repealed those instructions. This is the same Gen. Cass who was charged in the late canvass with being a Wilmot Proviso Abolitionist. How stands the case with Gen. Taylor? It affords me no pleasure to state that his course has not done justice to the South. You looked in vain to his Annual Message to Congress for any appeal to the North to give up your fugitive slaves, or to do you justice in relation to the question of slavery. But you will find that he recommends a miserable non-action policy, which is in the end, to accomplish the very object of the Wilmot Proviso.

This plan has become the scheme of the Abolitionists at the North. Gen. Taylor's policy has already been denounced by the veteran statesman, Henry Clay, to whose eloquence many of you have delighted to listen, and around whose standard many of you have rallied to rally. Yet in the face of these facts, my respected Governor, Manly, in a speech before the Whig Convention accepting the nomination, in speaking of the policy of Gen. Taylor, said:

"The Whig party of North Carolina, by a majority of 8000 votes, contributed to bring him into power, and we will be the last to desert the standard of the brave old soldier."

And again in the same speech he says:

"The Whig party may well congratulate themselves and the Nation, in having at the head of affairs such a man, at such a tremendous crisis as the present."

For myself, I must say, that I cannot congratulate any portion of the people of my State upon having at the head of affairs a man who persists in a policy so deadly hostile to our dearest rights. In vain may we elect and support those who do not represent those interests. Is this bitter pill of destruction to be gilded with the popular name of a military chieftain? The question is not whether you will "desert the standard of a brave old soldier," but it is whether you will permit yourselves to be betrayed by the false promises of a man who has no other object in view than to bring about a reversion to the Federal Government, yet I have always avowed myself the friend of a fair and judicious system of Internal Improvements by our State. But I have ever been opposed to such wild and extravagant schemes as were calculated to involve the State in a large debt, without the prospect of return of adequate advantages to the people. That I may not be charged with concealment, nor my views misrepresented, I will state, that had I been a member of the last Legislature I would have voted against the bill, chartering the Central Rail Road. My objections would have been more particularly confined to the details of the bill. I did not assent to those who were so high and honorable motives. The stock in that Road has been secured, and the charter has become the irrevocable law of the State, and this is no longer an open question.

The State is now largely interested in the Road. Under these circumstances, as a citizen of the State, I desire to see the faithful execution of the law and the good faith of the Democratic party, and to govern my public conduct in regard to that subject.

I desire to see our system of Common Schools encouraged and improved, until it shall answer the laudable purpose for which it was established. This has never been a subject in the success of which I have felt a deep interest. I voted with great pleasure for the bill, to amend the Legislature to establish Common Schools. During the late canvass in the West, Gov. Manly assailed my vote on an amendment to that bill, to distribute the School fund according to federal population. Whether he will do so again, I know not. In his published speech lately he presumed before the Whig Convention, and which I presume was intended for circulation in the East, as well as in the West, I observe he does not make this point, make this remark because the experience of the past has taught me what I have to expect for the future. I voted to distribute the School fund according to federal population because I thought that, upon the whole, it would be as satisfactory and as near right as any principle we could adopt. Since I gave my entrance into public life, the agitation of this subject led to what is familiarly known as the "Missouri Compromise." Although I believed that, in entering into that compromise, the South had, for the sake of peace and harmony, conceded too much to the North, yet when I came into public life I was disposed to carry out that compromise in good faith. We had a right to demand the same of the North, that she would, on her part, stand by the compromise. But in this we have been sadly disappointed. A very large portion of the people of the North now seek to violate it, by demands incompatible with the interests, the safety, and the honor of the Southern States. The Territory of the United States, the common blood and common treasure of all the States; and to appropriate it to the use of some of the States, to the exclusion of others, would be a violation of every principle of justice and equality. Moreover, a vast amount of slave property is every year escaping into the Northern States, and most of those States, instead of faithfully carrying out the compromise, are endeavoring to prevent its execution, and to prevent the recapture of fugitive slaves. In this way the South has lost millions. This grievance demands redress. The slavery question is of vital importance to us. To the North it is a mere abstract political question. To us, it is not only a question of right, involving an incalculable amount of private property, but it is a question of the safety, and above all, the domestic quiet and security of ourselves and families. The crisis demands that the South should take a firm stand in defence of her rights. I have always been a Union man. I yield to no man in devotion to this glorious Union, and I desire to see it preserved and perpetuated to all time. After the enjoyment of party rights, the preservation of the Union is more desirable to me than the preservation of the Union. But the best and surest means, in my humble opinion, to preserve and perpetuate the Union, is for the South to take a firm and decided stand in favor of her rights, against the encroachments of the North.

I did not approve of the movement in favor of calling the National Convention, and I personally, in accordance with a large number of gentlemen, both Democrats and Whigs, who were in favor of that Convention, enables me to repel the charge that they were in favor of treason or disunion. They are gentlemen of elevated patriotism, and are ardently attached to the Union.

I hope that these salutary counsels may prevail, and that this distracting question may at once be settled upon principles of justice to the South.

While a member of Congress I endeavored to adhere to the principles of the Missouri Compromise; and when a bill was before that body to establish a Territorial Government for Oregon, containing a clause inhibiting slavery, in that Territory—saying that no slave should be taken into that Territory, or restriction or against extending the protection of our laws to that distant people—I voted for the bill, together with many Southern gentlemen. Some partisan Whig newspapers have seized on this pre-text, and charged me with having voted for the Wilmot Proviso. This charge is untrue; for I am, and ever have been, opposed to the Proviso, and have never voted for it at any time or in any way.

The restriction in the Oregon bill applied to that Territory alone, all of which lies north of the Missouri Compromise line, whereas the Wilmot Proviso proposes to inhibit slavery both North and South of that line. I voted for the Resolutions—saying Texas, which is wholly south of the Missouri Compromise line, and all of Texas, North of the same line. These Resolutions were voted for by all the Democrats from the South, yet in doing so we did not vote for the Wilmot Proviso. While on this subject, it occurs to me that if these Whig partisans would spend more of their time in examining the opinions of their own candidates, and less in misrepresenting the opinions of Democratic candidates, it would be better for the country. Two years ago I cautioned them against voting for Gen. Taylor, without a public declaration of his opinions. They would not take my advice, but turned round and denounced Gen. Cass as a "Wilmot Proviso Abolitionist," and that too in the face of the fact that he had publicly declared his opinion to the contrary. Gen. Taylor was honored with the vote of North Carolina, and Gen. Cass was defeated. Since then, who has done more for the South than Gen. Taylor? Gen. Cass, although instructed by the Legislature of this State to vote for the Wilmot Proviso, boldly and elo-

quently appealed to the North to do us justice, and openly proclaimed that before he would vote to carry out the instructions to perpetrate this injustice upon the South, he would resign his seat in the Senate. His appeal to the people of this State was not in vain: the same Legislature assembled, and in a spirit of liberality highly creditable to themselves and still more complimentary to him, repealed those instructions. This is the same Gen. Cass who was charged in the late canvass with being a Wilmot Proviso Abolitionist. How stands the case with Gen. Taylor? It affords me no pleasure to state that his course has not done justice to the South. You looked in vain to his Annual Message to Congress for any appeal to the North to give up your fugitive slaves, or to do you justice in relation to the question of slavery. But you will find that he recommends a miserable non-action policy, which is in the end, to accomplish the very object of the Wilmot Proviso.

This plan has become the scheme of the Abolitionists at the North. Gen. Taylor's policy has already been denounced by the veteran statesman, Henry Clay, to whose eloquence many of you have delighted to listen, and around whose standard many of you have rallied to rally. Yet in the face of these facts, my respected Governor, Manly, in a speech before the Whig Convention accepting the nomination, in speaking of the policy of Gen. Taylor, said:

"The Whig party of North Carolina, by a majority of 8000 votes, contributed to bring him into power, and we will be the last to desert the standard of the brave old soldier."

And again in the same speech he says:

"The Whig party may well congratulate themselves and the Nation, in having at the head of affairs such a man, at such a tremendous crisis as the present."

For myself, I must say, that I cannot congratulate any portion of the people of my State upon having at the head of affairs a man who persists in a policy so deadly hostile to our dearest rights. In vain may we elect and support those who do not represent those interests. Is this bitter pill of destruction to be gilded with the popular name of a military chieftain? The question is not whether you will "desert the standard of a brave old soldier," but it is whether you will permit yourselves to be betrayed by the false promises of a man who has no other object in view than to bring about a reversion to the Federal Government, yet I have always avowed myself the friend of a fair and judicious system of Internal Improvements by our State. But I have ever been opposed to such wild and extravagant schemes as were calculated to involve the State in a large debt, without the prospect of return of adequate advantages to the people. That I may not be charged with concealment, nor my views misrepresented, I will state, that had I been a member of the last Legislature I would have voted against the bill, chartering the Central Rail Road. My objections would have been more particularly confined to the details of the bill. I did not assent to those who were so high and honorable motives. The stock in that Road has been secured, and the charter has become the irrevocable law of the State, and this is no longer an open question.

The State is now largely interested in the Road. Under these circumstances, as a citizen of the State, I desire to see the faithful execution of the law and the good faith of the Democratic party, and to govern my public conduct in regard to that subject.

I desire to see our system of Common Schools encouraged and improved, until it shall answer the laudable purpose for which it was established. This has never been a subject in the success of which I have felt a deep interest. I voted with great pleasure for the bill, to amend the Legislature to establish Common Schools. During the late canvass in the West, Gov. Manly assailed my vote on an amendment to that bill, to distribute the School fund according to federal population. Whether he will do so again, I know not. In his published speech lately he presumed before the Whig Convention, and which I presume was intended for circulation in the East, as well as in the West, I observe he does not make this point, make this remark because the experience of the past has taught me what I have to expect for the future. I voted to distribute the School fund according to federal population because I thought that, upon the whole, it would be as satisfactory and as near right as any principle we could adopt. Since I gave my entrance into public life, the agitation of this subject led to what is familiarly known as the "Missouri Compromise." Although I believed that, in entering into that compromise, the South had, for the sake of peace and harmony, conceded too much to the North, yet when I came into public life I was disposed to carry out that compromise in good faith. We had a right to demand the same of the North, that she would, on her part, stand by the compromise. But in this we have been sadly disappointed. A very large portion of the people of the North now seek to violate it, by demands incompatible with the interests, the safety, and the honor of the Southern States. The Territory of the United States, the common blood and common treasure of all the States; and to appropriate it to the use of some of the States, to the exclusion of others, would be a violation of every principle of justice and equality. Moreover, a vast amount of slave property is every year escaping into the Northern States, and most of those States, instead of faithfully carrying out the compromise, are endeavoring to prevent its execution, and to prevent the recapture of fugitive slaves. In this way the South has lost millions. This grievance demands redress. The slavery question is of vital importance to us. To the North it is a mere abstract political question. To us, it is not only a question of right, involving an incalculable amount of private property, but it is a question of the safety, and above all, the domestic quiet and security of ourselves and families. The crisis demands that the South should take a firm stand in defence of her rights. I have always been a Union man. I yield to no man in devotion to this glorious Union, and I desire to see it preserved and perpetuated to all time. After the enjoyment of party rights, the preservation of the Union is more desirable to me than the preservation of the Union. But the best and surest means, in my humble opinion, to preserve and perpetuate the Union, is for the South to take a firm and decided stand in favor of her rights, against the encroachments of the North.

I did not approve of the movement in favor of calling the National Convention, and I personally, in accordance with a large number of gentlemen, both Democrats and Whigs, who were in favor of that Convention, enables me to repel the charge that they were in favor of treason or disunion. They are gentlemen of elevated patriotism, and are ardently attached to the Union.

I hope that these salutary counsels may prevail, and that this distracting question may at once be settled upon principles of justice to the South.

While a member of Congress I endeavored to adhere to the principles of the Missouri Compromise; and when a bill was before that body to establish a Territorial Government for Oregon, containing a clause inhibiting slavery, in that Territory—saying that no slave should be taken into that Territory, or restriction or against extending the protection of our laws to that distant people—I voted for the bill, together with many Southern gentlemen. Some partisan Whig newspapers have seized on this pre-text, and charged me with having voted for the Wilmot Proviso. This charge is untrue; for I am, and ever have been, opposed to the Proviso, and have never voted for it at any time or in any way.

The restriction in the Oregon bill applied to that Territory alone, all of which lies north of the Missouri Compromise line, whereas the Wilmot Proviso proposes to inhibit slavery both North and South of that line. I voted for the Resolutions—saying Texas, which is wholly south of the Missouri Compromise line, and all of Texas, North of the same line. These Resolutions were voted for by all the Democrats from the South, yet in doing so we did not vote for the Wilmot Proviso. While on this subject, it occurs to me that if these Whig partisans would spend more of their time in examining the opinions of their own candidates, and less in misrepresenting the opinions of Democratic candidates, it would be better for the country. Two years ago I cautioned them against voting for Gen. Taylor, without a public declaration of his opinions. They would not take my advice, but turned round and denounced Gen. Cass as a "Wilmot Proviso Abolitionist," and that too in the face of the fact that he had publicly declared his opinion to the contrary. Gen. Taylor was honored with the vote of North Carolina, and Gen. Cass was defeated. Since then, who has done more for the South than Gen. Taylor? Gen. Cass, although instructed by the Legislature of this State to vote for the Wilmot Proviso, boldly and elo-

quently appealed to the North to do us justice, and openly proclaimed that before he would vote to carry out the instructions to perpetrate this injustice upon the South, he would resign his seat in the Senate. His appeal to the people of this State was not in vain: the same Legislature assembled, and in a spirit of liberality highly creditable to themselves and still more complimentary to him, repealed those instructions. This is the same Gen. Cass who was charged in the late canvass with being a Wilmot Proviso Abolitionist. How stands the case with Gen. Taylor? It affords me no pleasure to state that his course has not done justice to the South. You looked in vain to his Annual Message to Congress for any appeal to the North to give up your fugitive slaves, or to do you justice in relation to the question of slavery. But you will find that he recommends a miserable non-action policy, which is in the end, to accomplish the very object of the Wilmot Proviso.

This plan has become the scheme of the Abolitionists at the North. Gen. Taylor's policy has already been denounced by the veteran statesman, Henry Clay, to whose eloquence many of you have delighted to listen, and around whose standard many of you have rallied to rally. Yet in the face of these facts, my respected Governor, Manly, in a speech before the Whig Convention accepting the nomination, in speaking of the policy of Gen. Taylor, said:

"The Whig party of North Carolina, by a majority of 8000 votes, contributed to bring him into power, and we will be the last to desert the standard of the brave old soldier."

And again in the same speech he says:

"The Whig party may well congratulate themselves and the Nation, in having at the head of affairs such a man, at such a tremendous crisis as the present."

of that body, but met with no encouragement from those to whom I communicated my intention. Occupying a humble position, and possessing but little influence, I was fearful that a failure there might prove prejudicial to the cause of Constitutional Reform, which, I believed, I could at some day convince the people they ought to adopt. The time and state of public opinion then appeared unpropitious, and I abandoned my determination. Early in the year 1848, I determined to press the subject to the consideration of the people of the State. As federal politics had governed almost all the State for years, I foresaw that it would be difficult to procure for this subject that consideration which its importance demanded, unless it was adopted by one of the political parties. With this view I determined to attend the Democratic Convention to be held that Spring, and urge its adoption as an issue; and that if the Convention would not adopt it, I would seek some suitable occasion to make a speech upon the subject in my own county, and write it out for publication; and that I would publish essays on the subject, urging the consideration of this question to the people. Ill health prevented me from attending the Convention. When I heard from that Convention, I felt compelled to learn that I had been nominated for Governor, by the Convention, I received with surprise and pleasure. I wrote Mr. Holden a letter, stating that I should probably decline, but if I run I desired to make Equal Suffrage an issue. Believing the state of my health was such that a canvass of the State would be hazardous to my life, I subsequently wrote a letter declining the nomination. This letter was not published, and my friends prevailed upon me to withdraw it and to accept the nomination. The next day after I accepted I left home to meet my competitor, who was then engaged in the canvass. Before leaving home, I apprised some of my friends of my purpose to make this issue. When I reached Raleigh, I mentioned the subject to several of my friends, and they all expressed their approval of my intention, that the Standard would zealously advocate the measure. At Goldsboro, I mentioned the subject to friends I met there. When I arrived at Raleigh, I found that there were some who were not in favor of the measure. The Republican Mr. Gulick promised me that the Republican would zealously advocate the measure. My friends will recollect that in all these conversations that I made this issue was a favorite topic with me; and that these conversations and consultations on the subject were the result of my own suggestions. I had no consultation with any one in the State, neither did I receive from Washington City or elsewhere any suggestion, either written or oral, in relation to making this issue.

The Democratic party had nominated me without my knowledge or consent, and although they had not authorized me to make Equal Suffrage a question in the election, yet I believed they would sustain me if I did right; and I therefore took the responsibility to put "that ball in motion" on the 10th of May, 1848. This is the way in which the subject was introduced into the canvass of 1848. Whether Gov. Manly's "thunder" is imported from the "channel route tactics" of Washington City, I know not, and I do not care to know. I leave it to you, fellow citizens, to judge of this fact from his antiquated notions and compromising hostility to popular rights. I would sooner suspect that his "thunder" came from the "channel route tactics" of ancient Egyptian monarchs. If he draws his supplies from this source, I do not wonder that a proposition to extend the right of suffrage came to him, as he says, "like a clap of thunder from a clear sky."

What is the dearest privilege of an American citizen? It is to exercise the great and inestimable right of suffrage. In advocating this reform, I do not now, nor have I at any time, proposed to change the basis of representation for either the Senate or House of Commons. Let that remain as it is. What I do desire is that the people should be permitted to vote for the Commons, to vote also for the Senate, and that I might call your attention to the fact that this odious distinction does not exist in any other States of this Union. As the Constitution now stands, a man cannot vote for the Senate unless he owns a freehold of fifty acres of land. This is unjust, even between landholder and landholder. One man owns fifty acres worth \$25; he can vote for the Senate, while another may own one acre worth ten thousand dollars, yet the latter cannot vote for the Senate. It is still more unjust between those who own land, and those who do not. It is not to take the right of voting from the landholder, but it is to give the right of voting to the poor man, who is as faithful and without favor or partiality, but shall I receive a majority of your votes, the duties of the office shall be discharged as faithfully as I can.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant.

OWEN FENNELL.

July 12, 1850.

MARRIED.

In Sampson county, on the 4th ult., by HARRY HERRING, Esq., W. R. WARD, Esq., of Duplin, to Miss KEZIAH J. JOHNSON, daughter of Mr. NATHAN JOHNSON.

DEED.

Near Jacksonville, Onslow county, on the 1st instants, FANNY MONTFORT, aged about 69 years.

The death of this excellent lady is a bereavement which will be deeply estimated by those who dwell within the sphere of her gentle influence; and by them, indeed, will her memory be cherished in veneration and love, hallowed by the recollection of her kind and amiable deportment, and her cheerful submission under the many trials and sorrows which it was her destiny to encounter.

Some time before her death, she was seized with the heart's grief at her loss of the many hours of sorrow and care had been lightened by her kindly sympathy and her cheerful submission under the many trials and sorrows which it was her destiny to encounter.

And now that her career of usefulness has terminated, may her soul rest in peace, and may her memory be a blessing to all who know her. She was a true and faithful wife, a true and faithful mother, and a true and faithful friend. She was a true and faithful citizen, and a true and faithful Christian. She was a true and faithful woman, and a true and faithful friend. She was a true and faithful citizen, and a true and faithful Christian. She was a true and faithful woman, and a true and faithful friend.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant.

OWEN FENNELL.

July 12, 1850.

MARRIED.

In Sampson county, on the 4th ult., by HARRY HERRING, Esq., W. R. WARD, Esq., of Duplin, to Miss KEZIAH J. JOHNSON, daughter of Mr. NATHAN JOHNSON.

DEED.

Near Jacksonville, Onslow county, on the 1st instants, FANNY MONTFORT, aged about 69 years.

The death of this excellent lady is a bereavement which will be deeply estimated by those who dwell within the sphere of her gentle influence; and by them, indeed, will her memory be cherished in veneration and love, hallowed by the recollection of her kind and amiable deportment, and her cheerful submission under the many trials and sorrows which it was her destiny to encounter.

Some time before her death, she was seized with the heart's grief at her loss of the many hours of sorrow and care had been lightened by her kindly sympathy and her cheerful submission under the many trials and sorrows which it was her destiny to encounter.

And now that her career of usefulness has terminated, may her soul rest in peace, and may her memory be a blessing to all who know her. She was a true and faithful wife, a true and faithful mother, and a true and faithful friend. She was a true and faithful citizen, and a true and faithful Christian. She was a true and faithful woman, and a true and faithful friend.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant.

OWEN FENNELL.

July 12, 1850.

MARRIED.

In Sampson county, on the 4th ult., by HARRY HERRING, Esq., W. R. WARD, Esq., of Duplin, to Miss KEZIAH J. JOHNSON, daughter of Mr. NATHAN JOHNSON.

DEED.

Near Jacksonville, Onslow county, on the 1st instants, FANNY MONTFORT, aged about 69 years.

The death of this excellent lady is a bereavement which will be deeply estimated by those who dwell within the sphere of her gentle influence; and by them, indeed, will her memory be cherished in veneration and love, hallowed by the recollection of her kind and amiable deportment, and her cheerful submission under the many trials and sorrows which it was her destiny to encounter.

Some time before her death, she was seized with the heart's grief at her loss of the many hours of sorrow and care had been lightened by her kindly sympathy and her cheerful submission under the many trials and sorrows which it was her destiny to encounter.

And now that her career of usefulness has terminated, may her soul rest in peace, and may her memory be a blessing to all who know her. She was a true and faithful wife, a true and faithful mother, and a true and faithful friend. She was a true and faithful citizen, and a true and faithful Christian. She was a true and faithful woman, and a true and faithful friend.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant.

OWEN FENNELL.

July 12, 1850.

MARRIED.

In Sampson county, on the 4th ult., by HARRY HERRING, Esq., W. R. WARD, Esq., of Duplin, to Miss KEZIAH J. JOHNSON, daughter of Mr. NATHAN JOHNSON.

DEED.

Near Jacksonville, Onslow county, on the 1st instants, FANNY MONTFORT, aged about 69 years.

The death of this excellent lady is a bereavement which will be deeply estimated by those who dwell within the sphere of her gentle influence; and by them, indeed, will her memory be cherished in veneration and love, hallowed by the recollection of her kind and amiable deportment, and her cheerful submission under the many trials and sorrows which it was her destiny to encounter.

Some time before her death, she was seized with the heart's grief at her loss of the many hours of sorrow and care had been lightened by her kindly sympathy and her cheerful submission under the many trials and sorrows which it was her destiny to encounter.

And now that her career of usefulness has terminated, may her soul rest in peace, and may her memory be a blessing to all who know her. She was a true and faithful wife, a true and faithful mother, and a true and faithful friend. She was a true and faithful citizen, and a true and faithful Christian. She was a true and faithful woman, and a true and faithful friend.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant.

OWEN FENNELL.

July 12, 1850.

MARRIED.

In Sampson county, on the 4th ult., by HARRY HERRING, Esq., W. R. WARD, Esq., of Duplin, to Miss KEZIAH J. JOHNSON, daughter of Mr. NATHAN JOHNSON.

DEED.

Near Jacksonville, Onslow county, on the 1st instants, FANNY MONTFORT, aged about 69 years.